

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,008	12/12/2001	Igor Davidovich Kushnirskiy	0007056-0233/P6791	2453
26263	26263 7590 06/13/2005		EXAMINER	
SONNENSO P.O. BOX 06	CHEIN NATH & ROS	TRUONG, LECHI		
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/023,008	KUSHNIRSKIY, IGOR DAVIDOVICH			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		LeChi Truong	2194			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHOTHE I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day	nely filed s will be considered timely.			
- Failu Any r	re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	, cause the application to become ABANDONE	D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 February 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠	his action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-15,17-27 and 29-36 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-15,17-27 and 29-36 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen		n□				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5-15, 17-27, 29-36. Claims 4, 16, 28 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 10, 13-15, 17, 21-27, 29, 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Lewallen (US. Patent 6,854,123 B1).
- 3. As to claim 1, APA teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: An application program interface (API)(An application program interface (APA), page 2, ln 4-7), a non-scriptable plug-in API (plug-in APIs are non-scriptable, page 2, ln 4-7), a scriptable plug-in APA (scripting languages, page 4, ln 17-19).
- 4. APA does not explicit teach a plurality of bridges operatively configured to connect said scriptable and said non-scriptable plug-in APIs such that a scriptable plug-in program is able to access to the non-scriptable plug-in API in response to implementing the scriptable plug-in API. However, Lewallen teaches a plurality of bridges operatively configured to connect said scriptable and said non-scriptable plug-in APIs (the accompanying linkage data structures from the corresponding java object 30 to a new UI object, col 7, ln 46-49/ the brigge 4 including its

Art Unit: 2194

APA mappings, col 10, ln 51-55), a scriptable plug-in program is able to access to the non-scriptable plug-in API in response to implementing the scriptable plug-in API (a mapping of at least one user interface API interface corresponding to the determined standard API interface user interface API interfaces provide an implementation of the standard API interfaces in a user interface program, col 3, ln 42-45/ col 5, ln 35-40/col 9, ln 15-20/col 11, ln 32-37).

- 5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of APA and Lewallen because Lewallen's a plurality of bridges that a scriptable plug-in program is able to access to the non-scriptable plug-in API in response to implementing the scriptable plug-in API would improve the efficiency of APA's system by allowing the java developer to utilize the API interface standards to access non-Java components in the operating system.
- 6. As to claim 2, Lewallen teaches the scriptable plug-in API has a plurality of first interfaces (col 4, ln 56-61), the non-scriptable plug-in API has a plurality of second interface (col 6, ln 1-5/ Fig. 1), each of said bridges connects a respective one of the said first interfaces to respective one of said second interface (col 10, ln 51-57).
- 7. As to claim 3, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Lewallen teaches a cross platform language API (the bridge 4 including its API mappings, col 10, ln 51-55/ Fig. 1), a first interface (W3C API interface calls, col 5, ln 34-40), a second interface (the corresponding UI API 12 interface, col 5, ln 65-67 to col 6, ln 1-5), a second interface operatively configured to connect said non-scriptable plug-in API and said cross platform language API such that said scriptable language API able to access said non-scriptable plug-in API (col 6, ln 9-15).

Application/Control Number: 10/023,008

Art Unit: 2194

8. As to claim 5, Lewallen teaches, a non –scriptable object (the UI APIs 12, Fig. 1), such that said cross platform language object operates as a proxy for said non-scriptable plug-in object (col 8, ln 30-36).

Page 4

- 9. As to claim 9, APA teaches a JavaScript object, a perl object, a Python object (sec: Plug-In API, ln 4-6).
- 10. As to claim 10, Lewallen teaches XPCOM (col 6, ln 58-61).
- 11. As to claims 13, 14, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2 above.
- 12. As to claim 15, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above. In additional, APA teaches obtaining (create, page 2, ln 4-7).
- 13. As to claim 17, it is an apparatus claim of claim 5; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 5 above.
- 14. As to claims 21, 22, they are apparatus claims of claims 9, 10; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 9, 10 above.
- 15. As to claim 23, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Lewallen teaches generating a proxy support interface (col 8, ln 26-35), an inter-thread calls through said proxy (col 8, ln 34-39).
- 16. As to claims 24, Lewallen teaches an nsISupports Proxy (col 8, ln ln 30-36).
- 17. As to claims 25, 26, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 2; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 2 above.
- 18. As to claims 27, 29, 33-36, they are apparatus claims of claims 15, 17, 9, 10, 23, 24; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 15, 17, 9, 10, 23, 24 above.

Application/Control Number: 10/023,008

Art Unit: 2194

19. Claims 6-8, 18-20, 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Lewallen (US. Patent 6,854,123 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of XP (XPCom).

Page 5

- 20. As to claim 6, APA and Lewallen do not teach XPIDL interface. However, XP teaches XPIDL interface (XPIDL, page 2, ln 14-16).
- 21. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching APA, Lewallen and XP because XP's XPIDL interface would improve the efficiency of APA and Lewallen's systems by allowing the compiler to compiles the files to produce a cross platform binary type library.
- 22. As to claim 7, XP teaches a second interface is Xpconnect interface (Xpconnect, page 2, section: XPConnect and the Component object, ln 1-3).
- 23. As to claim 8, XP teaches a typelib files (sec: The XPIDL compiler, ln 12).
- 24. As to claims 18-20, 30-32, they are apparatus claims of claims 6-8; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-8 above.
- 25. Claims 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narin et al (US. Patent 6,691,176 B1) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).
- 26. As to claim 11, Narin teaches a scriptable plug-in (the connector object which is either Active X control or plug-in interface, col 4, ln 10-15/ col 5, ln 61-64), a proxy support interfaces

Art Unit: 2194

wherein said scriptable plug-in can perform inter-thread calls through said proxy support interface (col 14, ln 45-48), the inter thread calls (the connector object package the function call to a service for interpretation by the service manage which is a proxy, col 4, ln 10-12 and col 14, ln 45-48).

- 27. Narin does not explicit teach API. However, APA teaches API (the API is often used by a developer to create plug-in, page 2, ln 4-6).
- 28. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Narin and APA because APA's API would improve the use of Narin'system by allowing the system to send and receive data via the interface regardless of their type and the software provider.
- 29. As to claim 12, Narin teaches proxy support interface is an nsIsupports proxy (col 14, ln 45-48).

Response to the argument

- 29. Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims. Lewallen's reference meet the amended claims.
- 30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Application/Control Number: 10/023,008 Page 7

Art Unit: 2194

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100